

**REMARKS**

By the present amendment, independent claims 1, 7 and 10 have been amended to obviate the examiner's objections thereto and/or to further clarify the concepts of the present invention. Among other things, the subject matter of dependent claim 2 has been incorporated into independent claim 1 and thus represents claim 2 in independent form. In addition, the subject matter of dependent claim 9 has been incorporated into independent claim 7 and thus represents claim 9 in independent form. Claims 2 and 9 have been canceled. A Request for Continued Examination is filed concurrently. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

In the Action, claims 1-10 were rejected under the first paragraph of 35 USC § 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, it was alleged that subject matter in claims 1 and 7 was not supported. Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above claim amendments and the following comments is respectfully requested.

As mentioned above, claims 1 and 7 have been amended herein to obviate the examiner's objections thereto and/or to further clarify the concepts of the present invention. The limitation "the first hole completely filled with the bundle of carbon nanotubes of the heat conductor" has been deleted from claim 1. Similarly, the limitation "wherein the first hole is completely filled with the bundle of carbon nanotubes of the first heat conductor, and the second hole is completely filled with the bundle of the carbon nanotubes of the second heat conductor" has been deleted from claim 7. Thus, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1 and 7 under the first paragraph of 35 USC § 112 is now moot.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under the second paragraph of 35 USC § 112 as being indefinite. Specifically, it was alleged that a phrase in claims 1 and 7 was indefinite; and claim 10 contained a phrase apparently lacking in antecedent basis. Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above claim amendments and the following comments is respectfully requested.

As mentioned above, regarding to claim 1, the noted limitation is deleted as mentioned above. Regarding to claim 7, the claim has been amended to address the assertion contained in the Action. Moreover, the noted limitation is deleted from claim 7 as mentioned above. Regarding claim 10, the claim has been amended to address the Examiner's assertion. Therefore, the rejections of claims 1, 7 and 10 are now moot. It is submitted that the claims are now in full conformity with the provisions of the cited statute. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 7-8 were rejected as being unpatentable over the publication to Arik et al (US 2005/0006754). Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above claim amendments and the following comments is requested.

Applicant submits that the claims as amended patentably distinguish over the cited publication to Arik et al. In this regard, as was mentioned above, the subject matter of claim 2 has been incorporated into independent claim 1 and thus claim 1 now represents claim 2 in independent form. Since claim 2 contains allowable subject matter, applicant submits that the rejection of claim 1 has been overcome. In addition, the subject matter of dependent claim 9 has been incorporated into independent claim 7 and thus represents claim 9 in independent form. Since claim 9 contains allowable subject matter, applicants submit that rejection of claim 7 has been overcome as well.

In conclusion, it is respectfully requested that the examiner reconsider the above art rejection and allow the claims as amended which distinguish over the teachings of the cited Arik et al publication. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and allowance of claims 1, 7 and 8 as amended over the cited Arik et al publication are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the subject application is now in condition for allowance and early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, the undersigned hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-2340, along with any other additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP



Donald W. Hanson  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27,133

DWH/evb

Atty. Docket No. **040102**  
Suite 400, 1420 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 659-2930



**23850**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosure: RCE